

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 – 6, and 8 – 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo “Improving module reuse by interface adaptation,” p. 208 – 217. Specifically, the Examiner stated (among others):

As to claim 1, Purtilo teaches a running time system (system can create an execution-time module, p. 208, col. 2, paragraph 1), several components (component, p. 210, col. 2, paragraph 3), data acquisition (calling module, p. 210, paragraph 4), data disposal (called module, p. 210, paragraph 1), independent of program-defined interfaces (Nimble can create a new actual interface, p. 210, paragraph 5).

Claim 1 is amended to recite “data acquisition ... independent of programmer-defined interfaces in said second component” and “data disposal ... independent of programmer-defined interfaces in the second component.”

It is respectfully submitted that Purtilo teaches the use of interfaces which can be defined by a programmer using the Nimble software. More specifically, Purtilo states: “With the descriptions of these two interface patterns available, the programmer can then use Nimble to create a new actual interface.” (Page 210, last paragraph.)

In contrast, the claimed invention does not use interfaces which can be defined by the programmer. For example, the specification of the instant application states:

This process will be called “data acquisition from now on. In the component from which data are to be acquired, there is no need for special interfaces previously defined by the programmer. Accordingly, it is the called component’s job to store the results into suitable locations of other components. This process will be called “data disposal.” Also in this case, it is not necessary that the programmer has provided special interfaces for data disposal. In this context, the mere definition or declaration of a data field or a variable (if necessary including a type specification and further parameters) is not to be regarded as an “interface”. In contrast, an interface would be for example procedural instructions that have to be explicitly introduced into a component script by the programmer in order to start or enable a data transfer at the appropriate running time.

(Specification page 3, last paragraph.)

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

Claims 3 – 6 and 8 – 9 depend from allowable claim 1. Thus, it is believed that claims 3 – 6 and 8 – 9 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 – 6 and 8 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

As to claim 10, the Examiner states:

Purtilo teaches docking points (annotated actual parameter list is provided, p. 210, col. 2, paragraph 5), at least one docking point was found by entering call information (pick and choose, p. 210, col. 2, paragraph 5) about the further component at each docking point found.

Claim 10 is amended to recite "wherein said expansion of said program component system is completed without any expansion interface of said several components being defined by a programmer." Thus for the same reasons set forth above in conjunction with claim 1, it is believed that claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

Claims 11 – 13 depend from allowable claim 10. Thus, it is believed that claims 11 – 13 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11 – 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Purtilo be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo "Improving module reuse by interface adaptation," p. 208 – 217, in view of Craze (U.S. Pat. No.: 5,809,564). Claims 2 and 7 depend from allowable claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Craze fails to supply the teachings missing from Purtilo for claim 1. Thus for the same reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, it is believed that claims 2 and 7 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Purtilo in view of Craze be withdrawn.

Claims 14 – 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo "Improving module reuse by interface adaptation," p. 208 – 217, in view of Dievendorff (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,425,017). Claims 14 – 16 depend from allowable claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that Dievendorff fails to supply the teachings missing from Purtilo for claim 10. Thus for the same reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 10, it is believed that claims 14 – 16 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Purtilo in view of Dievendorff be withdrawn.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1 – 16 is earnestly requested. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than by allowance, he is respectfully requested to contact applicants' attorney at the phone number listed below so that additional changes to the claims may be discussed.

**STATEMENT**

In response to the Interview Summary mailed 29 September 2003, Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion that any agreement was reached related to all claim limitations being met. Applicant's representative acknowledges that independent claims 1 and 10 were discussed, however, it is respectfully submitted that no agreement was reached related to any of the claims.

Respectfully submitted

*Richard J. Coldren*

Richard J. Coldren  
Reg. No. 44,084  
Thorp Reed & Armstrong, LLP  
One Oxford Centre  
301 Grant Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425  
(412) 394-2442

Dated: 16 January 2004

Attorneys for Applicants